

REMARKS

With the foregoing amendment claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19, and 21-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 are independent. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

I. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 8, 17, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oie (US 6,188,431), claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oie, claims 2 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oie in view of Kiyokawa (US 6,024,877), claims 7, 9, 10, 12-16, 23, 24, and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oie in view of Watanabe (US 20020196197), and claims 11 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oie in view of Kiyokawa and Watanabe.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Oie because Oie does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. For example, at the least, Oie does not disclose “[a] first digital image capturing device [that] is configured to transmit to [a] second digital image capturing device an image captured by the first device, wherein the second device simultaneously displays on a display screen the captured image transmitted from the first device and a pointer for pointing to or indicating a portion of said captured image, wherein the first device controls movement of the pointer within the display screen,” as is recited in claim 1, as amended (emphasis added).

Oie discloses two cameras. Oie also discloses connecting the first camera to the second camera using a cable. Oie also discloses that the first camera is configured to transmit to the second camera an image captured by the first camera. But, nowhere does Oie disclose that the second camera “simultaneously displays on a display screen the captured image transmitted from the first device and a pointer for pointing to or indicating a portion of said captured image, wherein the first device controls movement of the pointer within the display screen,” as is recited in claim 1, as amended (emphasis added).

Because Oie does not disclose all of the features of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by Oie. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

B. Dependent Claims 2, 4-8

Claims 2 and 4-8 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 2, and 4-8 are patentable for at least the same reason give above with respect to claim 1.

C. Independent Claim 9

The above remarks for claim 1 apply to claim 9 because claim 9 requires “said data items include data for controlling the movement of a pointer overlaying an image displayed on a display screen of a second digital image capturing device, wherein said displayed image was captured by the first digital image capturing device and subsequently transferred to the second device.” As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Oie does not disclose two cameras connected by a link cable, wherein one of the cameras controls a pointer displayed by the other camera. Watanabe does not disclose this feature either. Thus, claim 9 is patentable over the art of record.

D. Dependent Claims 10-16

Claims 10-16 depend from claim 9. Thus, claims 10-16 are patentable for at least the same reason give above with respect to claim 9.

E. Independent Claim 17

Claim 17, as amended, is not anticipated by Oie because Oie does not disclose all of the features of claim 17. For example, Oie, at the least, does not disclose “transmitting a real time view of [an] image from the first digital image capturing device to the second digital image capturing device over [a] bi-directional link cable,” as is required by claim 17.

The Examiner argues that Oie does not disclose such a feature. However, the Examiner contends that Kiyokawa makes up for the deficient teaching of Oie. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order for claim 17 to be obvious over Oie in view of Kiyokawa, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the system disclosed in Oie to arrive at the claimed invention. The Examiner contends that Kiyokawa provides the suggestion/motivation. Applicant disagrees.

Kiyokawa does not suggest transmitting “a real time view of [an] image from [a] first digital image capturing device to [a] second digital image capturing device over [a] bi-directional link cable,” as is required by claim 17 (emphasis added). Kiyokawa discloses transmitting a real time view of an image from a first digital image capturing device to a second digital image capturing device using two modems and the telephone network. Kiyokawa further discloses that the advantage of transmitting a real time view between cameras is that it allows a camera operator to remotely control a distant camera. *See col. 1, ll. 44-49.* Oie has nothing whatsoever to do with the remote control of a distant camera. Accordingly, the teachings of Kiyokawa would not motivate one skilled in the art to modify the system of Oie.

Accordingly, claim 17 is patentable over Oie in view of Kiyokawa.

F. Claims 19 and 21-23

Claims 19 and 21-23 depend from claim 17. Thus, claims 19 and 21-23 are patentable for at least the same reason give above with respect to claim 17.

G. Independent Claim 24

The above remarks for claim 9 apply to claim 24 because claim 24 requires “transmitting pointer movement commands from said first device to the second device, wherein said pointer movement commands cause the slave device to move the pointer.” As discussed above with respect to claim 9, Oie does not disclose two cameras connected by a link cable, wherein one of the cameras controls a pointer displayed by the other camera. Watanabe does not disclose this feature either. Thus, claim 24 is patentable over the art of record.

H. Claims 25-28

Claims 25-28 depend from claim 24. Thus, claims 25-28 are patentable for at least the same reason give above with respect to claim 25.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the

Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
SIGNATURE			DATE	10/27/05	
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031